Sectt. II-48—33,702—27-11-48.

P-112E

P. Co. (Genl) (1925) Department.

M SERIES.

G.O. No. 778

DATED 11 6. 25

[Despatch Abstract.]

[illegible] No.W.[illegible]/[illegible]-I.[illegible], dated 17-12-24, to the Supdg. Engineer, Madras Circle.

I have the honour to request that you will be so good as to furnish information etc. required below:-

Ref: Your letter No.2552-Cl., dated 9-12-24, regarding appointment of P. Annaji Rao to Rs.100-10-200.

Please state if this promotion has been confirmed by the Chief Engineer as required in para 2 of G.O. 519-W, dated 12-4-17.

(3) No 4156 Ad 31-12-24

Reply.

Retransmitted.

Para 2 of G.O. No.519-W, dated 12-4-1917 applies, in my opinion, only to the first appointment made after the abolition of the special appointment of an upper subordinate on Rs.100-10-200.

/Sd/ R.V. Aroomugaswami Mudaliar,
Supdg. Engineer, Madras Circle.

No. 2752 A/29 12-24

Copy forwarded to the Chief Engineer, P.W.D., for information. The confirmation of the Chief Engineer referred to in para 2 of the G.O. was apparently necessary in the first instance as no mention was made in the G.O. as to whether a Lower Subordinate or an Upper Subordinate should be selected for the post. A Lower Subordinate was, however, selected by the Supdg. Engineer, [illegible] Circle in consultation with the Archaeological Superintendent and the nomination was duly confirmed by you in Memo No.[illegible]-C, dated 15-[illegible]-1917.

Charges were framed by the Executive Engineer, Bellary Division about the bad work and apparent dishonesty of the first incumbent, M.R.Ry. V.V. Rangaswami Ayyar, and proved to my satisfaction. I reverted the man to the ordinary cadre of Overseer and appointed in his place on 1-1-24, Overseer P. Annaji Rao of this Circle, in consultation with the Archaeological Superintendent. If you consider that para 2 of G.O. No. 519-W, dated 12-4-1917 [illegible] applicable to appointments to be made to the [illegible], I request you may [illegible]

Overseer P. Annaji Rao. I request also that the clause in para of the S.C. requiring your confirmation may be caused to be deleted as the appointment to this special post is made from the Overseer's cadre - though he draws a special rate of pay.

4 I should also like to be informed whether such an enquiry as now made by the Accountant-General is within the scope of an Audit Officer.

/Sd/ R.V. Arogyaswami Mudaliar,
Supg. Engineer, Madras Circle.

True copy forwarded:
(By Order)

Manager, Madras Circle Office.

R.S/26-12

J 26/12

3 Pr

Memo 4156 AD/24-1512/9-2-25

CRL 4156 AD. From the SE. Madras ONo 2752 Pdg 23.12.24
Mr P. Annaji Rao - Appointment as
Supdt Hampi ruins

The SE's appointment of Mr P. Annaji Rao as Supdt. Hampi Ruins is approved.

2 The SE is informed that it is within the competence of the AD to make the enquiry he has now made and that orders will be separately issued regarding his request to modify para 2 of Govt 1949/12.4.17

3

11) Issue
(2) DC/AD for
further action

26/2/25

27/2/25
for SE.

To
The [illegible] Madras Circle

2 MAR 1925

I.O.

P.W.D.

Supdt - Hampi Ruins - Appointment of -

Re -

pp 1-2 Cr. C.No 4156 Ad. from the S.E. Madras circle No 2752 G dy 29.12.24

WS

In his endt. read above the S.E. raises the following points

(1) Whether the orders in para 2 of Go. No 519. Wdy 12.4.17, refer only to the appointment ~~the~~ made in 1917, for the post of "Supdt, Hampi Ruins, or Whether they refer also to the appointment that may be made each time the post becomes vacant & is filled up.

(3)

(2) If it refers to A above the appointment of Mr P. Anaji Rao overseer as "Supdt - Hampi Ruins may be approved and the orders in para 2 of the Go. may be modified permitting the S.E. to make the appointment himself without submitting his nomination to the C.E. for approval as the post in question is being filled up from the cadre of "overseers" who are appointed by S.E.S, and

(3) Whether the audit officer is competent to enquire, as he has now done, The appointment has been approved by the Chief Engineer.

(1) above Attention is invited to Mr. Murray's note on pages 14 & 15 of Govt No 519 Wdy 12.4.17, on which apparently the orders in para

Wdy

of the G.O. were based. It will be observed that the man to be selected to the post of Supdt should not be the ordinary type of Subovesseers - now called Overseers - but should be a man possessing more than average intelligence. In order to see that the right sort of man is selected or not - the pay of the post being Special Viz, Rs 50 - 5 - 120 - it seems necessary that the nomination of the S.E. should be submitted to the C.E. for approval. Para 2 of the G.O. should therefore, it seems, be taken as referring also to appointments to be made each time the post becomes vacant & has to be filled up.

(2) above. With reference to the rule above the appointment made by the S.E. requires C.E's approval. No information has been furnished as to whether Mr. Annaji Rao who has been appointed is a man possessing more than average intelligence & has experience of Archaeological works & can keep the gang of watchmen there up to the mark. As however it is stated that the appointment has been made in consultation with the Archaeological Supdt. it may be approved as to whether ~~the~~ ~~man's personal~~ ~~records may first be called for.~~

Cf - S.E's letter No 736-28/31-8/4-9 dt 6-6-49 in G.O. 5786 15-9 P

As regards the request to modify the orders it is submitted that it may perhaps be ruled that the S.E. can himself make the appointment if the Archaeological Supdt. agrees to the nomination but if there is a difference of opinion the approval of the Chief Engineer should be obtained.

Yes 20/9/49

(3) above : As orders are worded at present, it is within the competence of the A.G. to make the enquiry he has made.

For orders.

20/1/25

Lee 17.1.25

Allen 20/1

20/1/25

~~LAD~~ US.

Recd 19/1

US

A Draft memo to the S.E. Madras circle confirming the nomination of Mr. P. Annaji Rao & informing him (the S.E.) as at A above is submitted

2. The finance dept.t have since raised the question as to why this appointment was not considered & dealt with when revising the Scale of pay of Overseers. The modification of para 2 of Govt. No. 579 W dy 12.4.27 as at B on page 2 ante may perhaps be deferred till the question raised at C has been considered. Meanwhile the S.E. may be told that orders will be issued separately on his request to modify para 2 of the G.O. The draft put up provides for this.

Vide linked file No. 723 F

C

3

3

Issued as memo No. 4156 A&J/24-1927-2-25

P.3.F

Lee 26/2/25

18/4/25

M/2/25

US A

SECR 354 SC 1925

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Finance(B.E.II.)

41.e.-Civil Works--Transferred--Establishment.

Superintendent, Humpi ruins.

The Superintendent was allowed a scale of pay of Rs. 50-5-120 in G.O.No.519 W dated 12-4-1917. It is now reported that he is in receipt of Rs.15 in addition as temporary addition to pay.

2 The Superintendent, Humpi ruins, is recruited from the ranks of Overseers. The pay of the Overseers of the P.W.D. was recently revised and fixed at Rs.50-~~5~~-24-100. It is not clear why the appointment of Superintendent, Humpi ruins, was not taken into consideration then and why he is allowed special pay of Rs. 50-5-120. Besides temporary additions to pay are now obsolete. Finance (E.T.) may perhaps be requested to examine this question. An extract of this para may be sent to that section.

T. A. S.
19-2-1925.

To Finance (E.T.) Section

1788/20/2/25

Finance (E.T)

Submit that P.W.D may be requested to put up the papers and to offer their remarks on A above.

20.2.25

CMC 20.2.25

P.W.D

Fin 7265 ET
20.2.25
(M) GOVERNMENT
Ac
723
WORKS DEPARTMENT

in no 7265 ET-1
20.2.25

24/2

PWD

US

Fono 519-20 WDs 12.4.17 referred to in para 1 of the Finance depts. note on the previous page is perhaps in the file. Vide flag "3"

2. There is no discussion in the notes to the Fost orders noted on the margin, relating to the revision of pay of Executive lower subordinates in the P.W.D, as to why the post of Supt. Hampi Ruins was excluded from consideration then. Apparently the post was excluded from consideration as it was a special appointment carrying already a special scale of pay of Rs 50-5-120 — Vide notes with fono 519 W/12.4.17. For the reasons given by the then Secy. P.W.D (Mr. S.B. Murray) in his note on pages 14 & 15 of the fo., it would seem that the appointment should still be continued to be treated as "Special" on the same scale of pay, though recruitment is made from the lower subordinates of the P.W.D. with these remarks the file may be returned to Finance.

fono 765W dt 21.8.22
" 1935 dt 14.2.23.

R

dt 50-5-120

(3)

(3)

A dt 50-5-120 with temy addn to pay admissible on Rs 65-5-145 vice temy addn in the scale

17.3.25
18.

18/3/25

As far as I remember the Supt Archaeological has something to say in the appointment & arrangements for payment of whole or part of the salary. Please look this up?

21/3/25

US

Please see para 2 of fono 519W (3)

519. wd 12.4.17 It will be observed that the Supdg Engineer has to consult the Supdt. Archaeological Surveys in selecting a man for the post of Supdt. Hampi Ruins. His pay is met from the funds in the Budget of the Archaeological Dept — which is a "central subject"

Vide letter to India No 136 dy 2-9-21 — para 3 flag V
+ for 9's reply No 3768 dy 24.11.21

(24)

Hg 1.4.25

S MRU 18/4/25

PWD 2/4/25

Finance

PWD 18.5.25
Dy 20.4

P.W. wo. 723 AD/25-1
20-4-25

Finance (ET)

15962
22.wo.5.

The question raised in para 2 of the Finance Dept's note on page 1 ante is dealt with in para 2 of the P.W.D. note on page 2 ante. In the circumstances stated Finance may perhaps agree to the post of Supdt. Hampi Ruins being treated as 'special' and his pay being fixed at the consolidated* rate of Rs 65-5-145 as proposed by P.W.D. the file may be sent to PWD for issue of orders.

*(including temporary addition)

2.5.25

Hg 2.5.25

agreed.

11.5.25

Minute No 15962 (ET)-1
11.5.25

PWD

DC 11.5

P.W.D

Please See the Finance Secl. note on the previous pag

A draft order sanctioning the revised Scale of pay is submitted. With reference to the orders at B and 2 of the note in the linked case, a para has also been included in the draft order.

The draft order may be sent to the Finance Secl. for acceptance & also for filling the regular number in para 2 thereof

It is the ... for ...

PW 25-5-25

Secy.

25/5

Finance

24.5.25

355 Sl.

P.W Dn 355 Sl-1

27-5-25

Finance (CT)

The draft order may be accepted, the appointment being registered as No 83 of 1925-26.

The file may be returned

21-5-25

(Cr) 20/5/25.

30.5.25

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVT. FINANCE DEPARTMENT. 28-MAY-1925

20350

SECRETARIAT PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 727 Sl 5TH JUN 1925

20350/27

P.W.D

The draft order may now be issued

VMM
6/6

P.W.D
6.6.16

AS
6/6

6/6

Scott.4.II-5 (a)—28,703—6-12-24. (6)

PWD DEPARTMENT.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.		
When copied		
When examined		
When signed		
When despatched		

Establishments – Superintendent Humph ruins – revised rate of pay. fixed.

(3)

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 519 W, dated 12. 4. 1917.

" " " " " " 192

READ ALSO:–

C. No. From the No. dated 192

" " " " " " 192

" " " " " " 192

ORDER.

Mis.

to

No. 778, dated 11. 6. 1925.

The pay of the Superintendent, Humph ruins will be revised as shown below

From

Rs 50 - 5 - 120 with temporary additions to pay

To

a Consolidated pay of Rs 65 - 5 - 145

2 The Sanction accorded in para 1 above is registered as No 83 of 1925-26

In modification of para 2 of the Proceedings

PWD Secy 13/6/25

To

The Chief Engineer P.W.D. (B&R)

– A.G. with Finance

– Finance Deptt.

– Supdt. Archaeological Survey

against above. We Govt now Consider that the Supg Engineer [illegible] himself make the appointment of the Archaeological Supdt agrees to the nomination but if there is a difference of opinion, the opinion of the Chief Engineer should be adhered

[illegible]
22/5.

[illegible]

[illegible]

In Communication
vide f. ante

Scott. II–47—697 Bks.—24-1-18 (5).

PW **DEPARTMENT.**

B. / N.P } (a)

ORDINARY ~~ROUTINE~~ SERIES.

† G.O. No .ted 191 .

CIRCULATED

NOT CIRCULATED.

~~NOT SEEN BY C.S.~~

Receipt numbers	7275 pt / 25
Number and date of previous proceedings.	5190 & 1254 1917

Tabling Abstract.

Establishment. Superintendent - Hinds

Rums - Revised rate 8/- per mens

(b) **Index Headings.**

MAIN HEADING Establishment

CROSS REFERENCES.

11/6/25

~~SPECIAL INDEX.~~

DO NOT SPECIAL INDEX.

(a) and (b) not to be filled in for 'Routine' Series.